

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

WEST VILLAGE MICHIGAN,
LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CANDICE TAYLER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 24-cv-13307

Honorable David M. Lawson

Magistrate Judge Elizabeth A. Stafford

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS LEAVE TO AMEND THEIR
ANSWER (ECF NO. 23) AND DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS TO STRIKE (ECF NOS. 15, 20)**

Plaintiff West Village Michigan, LLC, sues Defendants Candice Tayler and Powerful Sky Real Estate Management, LLC, for alleged violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), conversion, fraud, and misappropriation. ECF No. 1. The Honorable David M. Lawson referred the case to the undersigned for all pretrial matters under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). ECF No. 11.

Proceeding pro se on behalf of Powerful Sky and herself, Tayler answered the complaint. ECF No. 9. West Village moved to strike the answer and for entry of default. ECF No. 15. During a status conference

held on March 4, 2025, the Court informed Tayler that she could not represent Powerful Sky as a pro se litigant. ECF No. 18. The Court stayed the proceedings until April 30, 2025, to give defendants an opportunity to obtain counsel. *Id.*¹ West Village again moved to strike defendants' answer and for entry of default. ECF No. 20. Counsel appeared for defendants on April 29, 2025, and then filed an amended answer on May 14, 2025. ECF No. 21; ECF No. 23.

The Court held another status conference on May 15, 2025. With the parties' consent, the Court **GRANTS** defendants leave to file the amended answer submitted on May 14. And because defendants have appropriately responded to the complaint through counsel, the Court **DENIES** West Village's motions to strike and for entry of default as moot. West Village agreed to the denial of his motions during the May 15 status conference.

s/Elizabeth A. Stafford
ELIZABETH A. STAFFORD
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated: May 19, 2025

¹ The order's title erroneously stated that the case was stayed for thirty days, but the body of the order stated that the stay was in place until April 30. ECF No. 18.

NOTICE TO PARTIES ABOUT OBJECTIONS

Within 14 days of being served with this order, any party may file objections with the assigned district judge. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The district judge may sustain an objection only if the order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. 28 U.S.C. § 636. **“When an objection is filed to a magistrate judge’s ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the ruling remains in full force and effect unless and until it is stayed by the magistrate judge or a district judge.”** E.D. Mich. LR 72.2.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that this document was served on counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court’s ECF System to their email or First Class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on May 19, 2025.

s/Davon Allen
DAVON ALLEN
Case Manager